NIPWG 3-45.3

Paper for Consideration by NIPWG 3

IALA/IHO Interaction on the IMO's Maritime Service Portfolio Program

Submitted by:	United States (NGA)
Executive Summary:	This paper will discuss IHO/IALA interaction on the International Maritime Organization's Maritime Services Portfolio program and the potential shortcoming of the program
Related Documents:	NIPWG letter 1/2016 (Development of Marine Service Portfolios related to IHO work) IALA ENAV 19-14.1.21 (Liaison Note to IHO) IALA ENAV 19-12.4 (MSPs fully within IALA's domain) IALA ENAV 19-12.5 (Maritime Service Portfolios)
Related Projects:	IALA development of Vessel Traffic Services MSPs

Introduction / Background

The International Maritime Organization (IMO) has designated Maritime Service Portfolios (MSP) as the future means of providing digital ship-to-shore and shore-to-ship information. Sixteen (16) MSPs have been designated by the IMO. The IMO has designated Service Providers for all the MSPs.

The following MSPs fall within the scope of IHO responsibilities:

1. MSP 5—Maritime Safety Information (MSI) Service.
2. MSP 11—Nautical Chart Service.
3. MSP 12—Nautical Publications Service.
4. MSP 13—Ice Navigation Service.
5. MSP 15—Real-time Hydrographic and Environmental Service.

The following MSPs fall within the scope of IALA responsibilities:

1. MSP 1—VTS Information Service (IS).
2. MSP 2—Navigational Assistance Service (NAS).
3. MSP 3—Traffic Organization Service (TOS).
4. MSP 4—Local Port Service (LPS).

Based on the IALA *Liaison Note to IHO* (ENAV 19-14.1.21) "…the IHO (is invited) to provide comments on the IALA draft guidelines and consider how the two organisations can use this as a basis for further development and coordination of MSPs." The two major issues discussed in this paper are:

1. The appropriate number of Vessel Traffic Service MSPs.
2. Questions about the creation, operation, function, and maintenance of the IMO's MSP program.

Analysis/Discussion

The IMO created four separate MSPs for Vessel Traffic Services. Does the division of Vessel Traffic Services into four separate MSPs provide the most accurate presentation of this information or is the division only distinctions without differences to the user? Will the user appreciate the division of Vessel Traffic Services into four MSPs? What is the user at sea expecting from a Vessel Traffic Service? The expectations are:

1. What vessels are required to participate in the Vessel Traffic Service?
2. What Responsible Authority must be contacted?
3. What are the boundaries defining the area where the Responsible Authority is authorized to operate?
4. When (time before arrival) and/or where (reporting point, reporting line, etc.) must the Responsible Authority be contacted?

5. How is the Responsible Authority contacted (VHF, telephone, facsimile, e-mail, web interface, etc.)?
6. What information is the vessel required to provide to the Responsible Authority?
7. What information does the Responsible Authority provide to the vessel?

The only apparent difference among the MSPs is the information provided (No. 7 above) by the Responsible Authority to the vessel. Is it necessary to have four MSPs for such a small difference? Can we treat the Vessel Traffic Service as the equivalent of a Feature with the IS, NAS, TOS, and LPS treated as the equivalent of Attributes and reduce the number of MSPs to one called Vessel Traffic Service?

Based on the current status of the MSP program, there appears to be a significant disconnect between how the IMO wants the MSPs to be developed and what the Service Definition Owner will develop and provide to the IMO:

1. Who is driving the boat on the MSP project? Is there some sort of a chain-of-command in this process? Is there a consensus about who is in charge?
2. What is actually/will be in a portfolio? Will they be web site links, actual data files of some sort (pdf, html, XML, etc.), libraries of hard copy items that need to be in a vessel's library, etc.?
3. Who is actually populating the portfolios? Did the IMO come up with the MSP idea, expecting other organizations to populate the portfolios or are they going to adopt information currently existing or under development by other organizations?
4. Who will be responsible for maintaining the MSPs?
5. Is the IHO (via the WGs) doing this at the request of the IMO or has the IHO gone to the IMO with a "request" for guidance about the direction of the MSPs (with the IMO kicking the ball back saying "Why don't you tell us what we need?")?
6. What function will the MSPs serve in the future? How will they affect the work of the IHO (and by extension, the WGs)?
7. Will this be required information or just "nice to have information" to make the mariner's life easier? If it is required, it needs to be advertised and codified so regulated vessels can comply with the new rules during an inspection.

Conclusions

A distinct possibility exists that the less than adequate guidance provided by the IMO regarding the MSP program could result in a less than adequate result that would not be useful to the mariner.

Recommendations

1. NIPWG should maintain a close liaison with the IALA ENAV Committee to ensure consistency and accuracy between IHO and IALA MSP responsibilities.
2. Recommend the Vessel Traffic Service MSPs be reduced from four to one.
3. Ensure the S-127 (Traffic Management) Product Specifications are included in the Vessel Traffic Services MSP.
4. Submit this paper to the IALA ENAV Committee for their input and comment.

Action Required of NIPWG

The NIPWG is invited to:

a. note this paper.

b. provide comments and input to improve the quality of this paper.